

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/474,980 12/		2/29/1999	Eugene M. Johnson	6029-2668	3036
21888	7590	11/22/2004		EXAMINER	
THOMPSO		,	HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON		
ONE US BANK PLAZA SUITE 3500 ST LOUIS, MO 63101				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1647	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Application No.	
Advisory Action	09/474,980	JOHNSON ET AL.
	Examiner Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2004 FAILS TO PLATHER FOR THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2004 FAILS TO PLATHER FOR THE PROPERTY OF	CE THIS APPLICATION IN COM	NDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	n places the application in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailir		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 0	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 15 November 2004. 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	· · · ——	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: none.		·
Claim(s) objected to: none.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>32, 35-37</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .		
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	Thenda Your back
10. Other:		ARENDA BRUMBAUK
Q_{1}	SU	PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants did not fully address the Examiner's comments on page 3 of the 20040628 Office action. In other words, additional evidence/claim limitations are needed (e.g., deleting "are apable of", etc.). Note that in contrast to Applicants' assertions, the pending 102(e) rejection does teach the new claim limitation of nonoclonal" antibodies (see page 3 of 20040628). The issue remains cross-reactivity at conserved residues between neurturin and ersephin, which the current claims still encompass.

ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D. PATENT EXAMINER